




3 1761 11224515 4

CA 1 XC14 R11

1058 M



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto



<https://archive.org/details/31761112245154>

CAI  
XC 14  
-R 11

HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session—Twenty-fourth Parliament

1958

---

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND  
TELEGRAPH LINES

*Chairman:* GORDON K. FRASER, ESQ.

---

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 5

---

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT ESTIMATES

---

Bill C 26—An Act to incorporate the Lakehead Harbour  
Commissioners.

---

including

Second and Third Reports to the House

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1958

TUESDAY, JULY 22, 1958

---

WITNESSES

The Honourable George Hees, Minister of Transport; Messrs. J. R. Baldwin, Deputy Minister; Air Vice-Marshal de Niverville, Director General of Air Services; N. Wilson, Director, Marine Services; G. Morisset, Air Transport Board; R. Kerr, General Counsel, Board of Transport Commissioners; J. E. Dumontier, Director, Engineering Branch, Board of Transport Commissioners.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.  
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1958



STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON  
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

*Chairman:* Gordon K. Fraser, Esq.,  
and Messrs.

Allmark,	Garland,	McPhillips,
Asselin,	Grills,	Michaud,
Badanai,	*Gundlock,	Monteith ( <i>Verdun</i> ),
Baldwin,	Hales,	Nielsen,
Baskin,	Hardie,	Nixon,
Batten,	Horner ( <i>Acadia</i> ),	Pascoe,
Bigg,	Horner ( <i>Jasper-Edson</i> ),	Payne,
Bourbonnais,	Howard,	Phillips,
Brassard ( <i>Chicoutimi</i> ),	Howe,	Racine,
Brassard ( <i>Lapointe</i> ),	Johnson,	Rouleau,
Bruchési,	Keays,	Rynard,
Campbell ( <i>Stormont</i> ),	Kennedy,	Smallwood,
Chevrier,	LaRue,	Smith ( <i>Calgary South</i> ),
Chown,	MacEwan,	Smith ( <i>Simcoe North</i> ),
Creaghan,	MacInnis,	Tassé,
Crouse,	Martini,	Taylor,
Drysdale,	McBain,	Thompson,
Dupuis,	McDonald ( <i>Hamilton</i>	Tucker,
English,	<i>South</i> ),	Webster,
Fisher,	McMillan,	Wratten—60.

\*Replaced on July 4, 1958 by Mr. Brunsdén.

J. E. O'Connor,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*

CAL  
XC15  
-R17

## ORDERS OF REFERENCE

FRIDAY, July 4, 1958.

*Ordered*,—That the name of Mr. Brunsdon be substituted for that of Mr. Gundlock on the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

WEDNESDAY, July 9, 1958.

*Ordered*,—That Bill No. C-26, an Act to incorporate the Lakehead Harbour Commissioners, be referred to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,  
*Clerk of the House.*





## REPORTS TO THE HOUSE

THURSDAY, July 17, 1958.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines has the honour to present the following as its

### SECOND REPORT

Your Committee has considered the following Bill and has agreed to report it without amendment:

Bill No. C-26, An Act to incorporate the Lakehead Harbour Commissioners.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence adduced in respect of the said Bill is appended.

Respectfully submitted,

G. K. FRASER,  
*Chairman.*

TUESDAY, July 22, 1958.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines has the honour to present the following as its

### THIRD REPORT

On Wednesday, June 18, 1958, the House referred to your Committee for consideration Items numbered 414 to 430, 433 to 441, 444 to 472, 512 to 516, all of which are inclusive, of the Main Estimates 1958-59, and Items 628 to 634, 636 to 651, both inclusive, and 661 and 662 of the Supplementary Estimates 1958-59.

Your Committee has held 7 meetings and heard and questioned the Honourable George Hees, Minister of Transport, and the following officers from the Department of Transport and related agencies:

Mr. J. R. Baldwin, Deputy Minister; Mr. R. J. Burnside, Director, Canal Services; Mr. N. Wilson, Director, Marine Services; Mr. A. Watson, Director, Ship Construction and Supply; Mr. A. Cumyn, Director, Marine Regulations Branch; Captain F. S. Slocombe, Chief, Nautical Division; Air Vice-Marshal A. de Niverville, Director General of Air Services; Mr. F. G. Nixon, Director, Telecommunication Branch; Mr. J. R. H. Noble, Meteorological Branch; Mr. H. J. Connolly, Director, Construction Branch; Mr. L. C. Audette, Chairman, Canadian Maritime Commission; Mr. M. Marcher, Chairman, National Harbours Board; Mr. G. Morisset, Member, Air Transport Board; Mr. R. Kerr, General Counsel, Board of Transport Commissioners; Mr. J. E. Dumontier, Director, Engineering Branch Board of Transport Commissioners.

Your Committee has considered the above listed items, approves them and recommends them to the House for approval.

During its deliberations the Committee learned of the increased responsibilities accepted by the Department in recent years, arising out of the very



rapid growth in transportation and communications in Canada, both in relation to movement between the settled areas of Canada and the opening of Northern Canada and our Arctic regions. Evidence was placed before the Committee concerning the large addition in the number of airport projects required to satisfy the needs of Canadian aviation in our major cities and in the extreme North, and information regarding the substantially increased requirements for icebreaking, marine aids and northern marine patrol work, and the related substantial increase in the construction program of departmental ships. Special emphasis was given to the greatly increased need for electronic aids to marine and air navigation.

The continued close co-operation between the Department, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission toward the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project was noted with satisfaction. The importance of the Seaway and its beneficial effect on Canadian inland ports was recognized by your Committee, and a recommendation that municipalities which expect to enjoy maximum benefits from the Project should survey existing port facilities and endeavour to determine necessary additional requirements, received the general support of members. The Committee recommends for the consideration of the Department the establishment of an economic survey to consider the effects of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project upon all regions of Canada.

Your Committee was pleased to learn that amendments to the Canada Shipping Act relating to pilotage on the Great Lakes are contemplated.

The Committee wishes to commend the Minister and officers of the Department for the successful arrangements made with the Towns of Thorold and Merritton and the City of St. Catharines, Ontario, in connection with the remodelling of the Second Welland Canal locks and channel. The conversion of this abandoned canal, for many years a hazard to residents of the area, into a valuable asset for drainage in the area is appreciated. Work on this project is expected to commence this summer.

Your Committee heard with approbation the work of the Department in conjunction with the Canadian Boating Federation in the testing and determining of power and load capacities of small boats and the promotion of an extension of the use of "capacity loading plaques" by Canadian boat manufacturers. It is felt that this program coupled with the many improved items of safety equipment now available will further contribute to the safety of boating generally.

The major construction program relating to the maintenance, improvement and extension of runways, taxiways and aprons at airports across Canada in order to cope with the increasing amount of air travel and to accommodate the larger and more advanced types of aircraft was presented to your Committee. The Department's Airport Terminal Building Projects were outlined, and it was observed that more than 17 airports have benefitted during the past year or will in the near future benefit from the construction of new Terminal Buildings.

Your Committee was pleased to learn that provision has been made for the takeover by the Department, of direct operation and maintenance of the Northwest Territories and Yukon Signal System from the Department of National Defence. This will permit some degree of integration with services already operated in the area by the Department and make possible a saving of 10 per cent or more in the annual operating cost. It is intended that the high standard of public service maintained in the past by the Royal Canadian Corps of Signals will be continued.



Consistent with the Government's program for the accelerated development of Canada's North and Arctic regions, it is proposed to carry out, within the next year, certain improvements and the modernization of equipment and expansion of facilities.

Your Committee wishes to record its appreciation to officers of the Department of Transport, the Canadian Maritime Commission, the National Harbours Board, the Air Transport Board, and the Board of Transport Commissioners who appeared before it and contributed to its work.

A copy of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence is appended.

Respectfully submitted,

GORDON K. FRASER  
Chairman.





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, July 17, 1958.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines met at 10.05 a.m. this day. The Chairman, Mr. Fraser, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Asselin, Badanai, Baldwin, Brassard (*Chicoutimi*), Campbell (*Stormont*), Chevrier, Chown, Creaghan, Crouse, Drysdale, English, Fisher, Fraser, Garland, Hales, Horner (*Jasper-Edson*), Horner (*Acadia*), Howard, Kennedy, Martini, McDonald, McMillan, McPhillips, Monteith (*Verdun*), Pascoe, Rynard, Smith (*Simcoe North*), Smith (*Calgary South*), Thompson, Tucker, and Wratten—(31).

*In attendance:* The Honourable George Hees, Minister of Transport; Messrs. J. L. Baldwin, Deputy Minister; J. E. Devine, Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister; A/V/M de Niverville, Director General of Air Services; H. J. Connolly, Director, Construction Branch; L. G. Fitton, Administrator of Airways; N. Wilson, Director, Marine Services; H. R. Press, Airports. G. Morisset, Member, Air Transport Board; R. Kerr, General Counsel, Board of Transport Commissioners; J. E. Dumontier, Director, Engineering Branch, Board of Transport Commissioners.

The Chairman observed the presence of quorum and called Item 463—Air Services—Grants for the development of Civil Aviation.

Following the questioning of Mr. Hees, Mr. Baldwin and A/V/M de Niverville, the item was adopted.

Item 464—Contributions to Municipalities or Public Bodies for Construction and improvements of Airports on Land acquired by such organizations—was called and adopted.

Item 465—Contributions toward Airport Development and Other Airport Projects—was called and adopted.

Item 648 (Supplementary)—Contributions toward Airport Developments and Other Airport Projects—was called and adopted.

Item 466—Contributions to Other Governments or International Agencies—was called and adopted.

Item 514—For the acquisition of land for control of properties in the vicinity of main terminal airports—was called and adopted.

Item 515—Loan to the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation—was called and adopted.

Item 512—Loans to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority—was reopened by consent, discussed and closed.

Item 467—Air Transport Board—Salaries and Other Expenses—was called and following the questioning of Mr. Morisset, was adopted.

Item 468—Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—Administration, Operation and Maintenance—was called and following the questioning of Mr. Kerr and Mr. Dumontier, was adopted.

Item 649 (Supplementary)—Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—Administration, Operation and Maintenance—was called and adopted.

Item 469—Amount to be credited to the Railway Grade Crossing Fund—was called and adopted.

The Chairman read the title of Bill C-26, An Act to incorporate the Lake-head Harbour Commissioners and called, for consideration, Clause 1 of the Bill.

Mr. Wilson was introduced to the Committee and following questioning, Clauses 1 to 25 were adopted.

The enacting clause, title and Bill were adopted and the Chairman ordered to report the Bill without amendment to the House.

At 11.40 a.m. the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.



## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, July 22, 1958.

The Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines met at 10.05 a.m. this day *in camera*. The Chairman, Mr. G. K. Fraser, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Allmark, Asselin, Badanai, Baldwin, Baskin, Bigg, Brunsdon, Campbell (*Stormont*), Chevrier, Drysdale, Fisher, Fraser, Grills, Hales, Horner (*Jasper-Edson*), Howard, Keays, Kennedy, Martini, Pascoe, Payne, Smallwood, Smith (*Simcoe North*), Smith (*Calgary South*), Tasse, Thompson, Webster, Wratten—28.

A draft "Report to the House" containing the observations and recommendations of the Committee was read and following discussion and amendment was adopted and ordered to be presented to the House as the Committee's "Third Report".

The Chairman thanked members of the Committee for their co-operation.

At 11.20 a.m. the Committee adjourned to meet again at 10.00 a.m. Thursday, July 24, 1958 for the consideration of certain private bills.

J. E. O'Connor,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*





## EVIDENCE

THURSDAY, July 17, 1958.

10:00 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I see a quorum. This morning we are on the items of the Estimates of the Department of Transport. We only have a few more items and after we have completed them we will move on to Bill C-26, an Act to incorporate the Lakehead Harbour Commissioners.

We are on page 82 of the main estimates.

Item 463. Grants for the development of civil aviation in the amounts detailed in the estimates ..... \$61,348,000

Are there any questions on this item?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Could we find out how the program for the training of pilots, instructors, and so on, is proceeding, if it is still in existence?

Hon. GEORGE HEES: (*Minister of Transport*): It is unchanged, but increasing slightly every year.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Are pilots being trained under this grant?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How many in the last year?

Mr. HEES: About 1,800, and we expect that there will be 2,000 this year. It has been 1,800 in the past year.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I wonder whether or not the department has given any consideration to organizing an equivalent to the C.A.P. in the United States? A lead has been given in two of our cities in organizing private aviation to a point which has proven to be very useful in the event of a disaster. It is not under a national defence item. All the elements, which do not come under the Royal Flying Clubs, could assist generally a civil aeronautical control unit which, if possible, would come under the Department of Transport. It does not need a grant, but rather needs more organizational help.

Mr. HEES: We have had meetings with Department of National Defence on this matter. This comes, primarily, under them; they are giving very active consideration to it at the present time. They are working on it.

Item agreed to.

Item 464. Contributions to Municipalities or Public Bodies for Construction and Improvements of Airports on Land Acquired by such Organizations, including contributions to appropriate authorities in respect of airports at Lourdes-du-Blanc-Sablon and at Harrington Harbour, Quebec ..... \$125,916

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask if the amount mentioned in the details covering those municipalities include them all? Are there any other contributions being made to municipalities over and above those mentioned in the details on page 588

Mr. HEES: The next vote covers the total contributions towards municipalities.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask if any consideration has been given to the establishment of an airport at Cornwall?

Mr. J. R. BALDWIN (*Deputy Minister, Department of Transport*): To the best of my recollection, our offer to the city is still outstanding; that is, if

at any time they wish to acquire land and agree to operate a field, we will be prepared to make a recommendation to obtain the necessary funds for construction.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Would the minister give consideration to this aspect of the Cornwall situation; it is now, because of its position on the seaway, a centre for both power and navigation and it may well be that this is one of the cases which fits into the program where the department should foot the whole cost for the construction of an airport. I know that there are some other cases—or rather I should say I believe there are some other cases where this has been done. Perhaps this is a case which merit consideration.

Mr. HEES: We will be very glad to consider it.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I wonder if the department could, perhaps, say a word—I realize this was discussed to a certain extent at the last meeting—in respect of the policy concerning contributions towards municipal airports and as to whether the government makes direct contributions towards the construction entirely under the Department of Transport. Two municipalities in our province have now very satisfactory utilities at their airports which are municipally owned. Would the government be well advised to encourage that in more detail rather than outright construction? I am speaking of larger areas because naturally a smaller airport would not have the traffic and the utility would not be the same as a utility at a larger airport.

Based on the experience of Calgary, I do not think it would be in the interest of the government to give more encouragement to municipally owned and constructed airports.

Mr. HEES: We are very happy to enter into an agreement with a municipality if they are willing to operate the airport.

Perhaps I could give a little more information. The present arrangement under which the majority of airports are federally operated, particularly in the secondary field category, is the result of historical development and war-time growth. Basically speaking, however, the present policy is that the federal government encourages municipal operation of airports, and at main line airports served by scheduled services may, if necessary, pay a subsidy to a municipal airport operator to meet operating deficits. If the municipality is not prepared to operate the field and if the field is a major airport required to carry out international commitments, the federal government would assume responsibility.

In other cases, particularly requests for construction of a new airport, the federal government normally requires municipal participation, giving as a minimum assurance it will provide the land for the airfield and agree to operate it after the federal government has constructed it.

In the case of local airports, dollar for dollar participation may also be required. The granting of operating subsidies to meet municipal deficits are dealt with by special investigation, both technical and economical, in each case, and then referred to Treasury Board for decision.

Mr. CHOWN: About three years ago the St. James, Winnipeg, airport made application to the Department of Transport to have returned to it for operation and administration the Stevenson Field at Winnipeg. What is the status of that application at the present time?

Mr. BALDWIN: The Winnipeg airport at Stevenson field is in a rather special category in that it is a large military base as well and also an international port of call and it falls rather in the category of major airports of the type normally operated by the federal government.

I cannot recall any form of specific request from the city officials of Winnipeg and St. James jointly on that point, although there were a number



of discussions at which we discussed with them the possibility of operation of the field. I would have to refresh my mind as to what happened as a result of this discussion, but off-hand I would say that it just petered out.

Mr. CHOWN: May I ask, inasmuch as I was on that commission, that we have a report on that? May I ask for that independently?

Mr. HEES: I would be very glad, if you wish you could come down to the department any time, and talk it over with our officials.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the status of the Vancouver airport? Is it still municipally owned?

Mr. HEES: Yes, and as far as we are concerned we are very happy about it. I should not say it is municipally owned. It is municipally operated, and we think it is very well run.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How many airports are municipally owned and operated?

Mr. BALDWIN: Among the major ones are Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Fredericton, and Saint John. I think there are half a dozen others in a secondary category such as Timmins, Sudbury, and so on.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the status of all those small airports, or strips that were to be built at Thunder River, Natashquan, and so on? Have they been done?

Air Vice-Marshal A. de NIVERVILLE (*Director General, Air Services, Department of Transport*): Yes. Natashquan has been completed. Thunder River has been brought to the state of a northern strip; it is not a first-class airport. Natashquan still wants a little work to be done. The local people have brought to the attention of the department that possibly some binding material could be used to keep the sand from blowing away.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is there a strip at Riviere au Tonnerre?

Mr. de NIVERVILLE: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it contemplated to build other strips along the north shore to Baie Comeau; between Seven Islands and Baie Comeau?

Mr. de NIVERVILLE: They have been built by private companies at places like Shelter Bay and others. They were used by Quebec Air illegally. They are still in existence and usable for light aircraft.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the status of the airstrip between Tadoussac and Murray Bay?

Mr. de NIVERVILLE: That requires a little more work before it is properly usable.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Has any money been spent on it?

Mr. de NIVERVILLE: There was some spent.

Mr. RYNARD: In respect of the municipally owned airports I would like to ask if the Department of Transport sets a certain specification across Canada or whether or not there is any control or licensing of those municipally owned airports?

Mr. HEES: Yes. They are licensed if operated for public use.

Mr. RYNARD: In other words they have to come up to the standards and specifications set by the department.

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. CHOWN: I was going to ask the minister what the policy is with reference to private flying clubs presently operating off fields such as Stevenson airport where you have a joint civilian and air force operation and where there is a need for establishing separate strips for these smaller planes in the interests of safety.

Mr. HEES: Where we have large fields like that our plan is to develop satellites in the vicinity to take some of the pressure off the larger fields, especially fields where we have a lot of commercial carriers and military planes at the same time.

Mr. CHOWN: Is there a need for such a satellite field at Stevenson airport?

Mr. HEES: We are looking for a site at the present time. I am advised that we have found a site which is suitable to us but some of the local people are objecting. We have to get this straightened out. Perhaps that is a matter which you might discuss when you come down to the department and you may be able to help us.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I would like to add that we had in Canada almost without exception—perhaps Winnipeg is the only exception—discarded R.C.A.F. flying areas in which the Department of National Defence had in many instances given no indication as to whether or not they had any future use for them. It seems to me that a little cooperation in this matter could move much of this private flying into those fields.

Mr. GARLAND: What is the proximity that these satellites have to be located to the main base?

Mr. HEES: It is a matter of convenience to the communities served. It is not a question of proximity to the main base. It is a question of proximity to the municipality concerned and is largely a matter of convenience to the people in the main community.

Mr. GARLAND: There is not any particular limit?

Mr. HEES: No.

Item agreed to.

Item 465. Contribution toward airport development and other airport projects on cost-sharing basis, in the amount detailed in the estimates ..... \$245,000

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I renew my question here about the status of the airport at Murray Bay?

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes, sir. The airport, if my recollection is right, requires roughly \$70 or \$75 thousand more to be spent on it to put it into proper condition for use by aircraft up to the DC-3 type. We have in this vote \$50,000 for a cost-sharing grant in aid in the hope that the municipality will be able to find the balance of the funds.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is the municipality holding up the project?

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes; because of its inability to meet our grant.

Mr. CHEVRIER: No consideration has been given for a strip?

Mr. BALDWIN: It is partially built now.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The strip?

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What planes can land there?

Mr. BALDWIN: We do not recommend, except in very dry weather, much of anything landing there.

Item agreed to.

Supplementary Item 648. Contributions toward airport development and other airport projects on cost-sharing basis, in the amounts detailed in the estimates—Further amount required ..... \$123,176

The CHAIRMAN: This item corresponds approximately to item 465.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is being done at Gander under this vote?

Mr. BALDWIN: This is the wind-up contribution of our grant towards the cost of construction of the new schools in the town of Gander.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is the new terminal at Gander completed?

Mr. HEES: That has been completed for some time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it being used?

Mr. HEES: Not the new one; no.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It is still on the old site?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Item 466. Contributions to Other Governments or International Agencies for the operation and maintenance of airports, air navigation and airways facilities.... \$236,227

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the status of Kinross? I presume a portion of this grant is for the repair, maintenance and capital cost of the Kinross airport?

Mr. BALDWIN: Primarily, if I remember correctly, it is for the aeronautical facilities at Houghton and Grande Marais. Kinross is a United States field which has been used to serve the Sault. There is some United States military construction going on this summer which has substantially interrupted civil use.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is T.C.A. using these two airports?

Mr. BALDWIN: Houghton and Grande Marais are beacon or radio ranges. They use them in flying the Airway to the Lakehead and they are primarily for Canadian use. The Director General says that Kinross this summer is restricted to DC-3's only, until the military construction program is completed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is our cost of being a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization going up or down?

Mr. BALDWIN: It is not varying very extensively. Those funds are voted through the Department of External Affairs. These are special contributions to cost sharing arrangements for north Atlantic aviation facilities, the cost of which is shared between user nations.

Mr. McDONALD (*Hamilton South*): May I revert to item 459 for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. McDONALD (*Hamilton South*): Could the minister comment on the new aircraft accident investigation organization set up in the Department of Transport? I understand there has been a new division set up in the Department of Transport having to do with the investigation of accidents.

Mr. HEES: Yes. The investigation of aircraft accidents has been one of the functions of the Air Regulations Division until 1958. The inadequacy of this arrangement is being corrected by the creation of the separate division whose members may be expected to become expert in their work through process of selection, training and specialization. The organization will consist at the outset of a chief, assisted by five investigators at Ottawa, and a technical officer with one investigator and an aircraft inspector in each of the six regions.

The regional investigator must rely, as at present, on the existing staff of the Air Regulations and Aeronautical Engineering Divisions for assistance in various practical and technical aspects of his work.

The time and place of an aircraft accident being unpredictable imposes the requirement that all members of this investigating agency must be ready to travel within or beyond the boundaries at a moment's notice and the new organization will take account of this requirement. It will be recognized that the need for the further progressive development of the Accident Investigation Division is a real one when it is noted that more than five hundred reportable aircraft accidents have occurred in the calendar year 1957.



Mr. McDONALD (*Hamilton South*): Will they investigate every type of accident in Canada whether it involves a private aeroplane or a company aeroplane?

Mr. HEES: Yes. All accidents including minor accidents.

Item agreed to.

Item 514. To provide for the acquisition of land for control of properties in the vicinity of main terminal airports to prevent the erection of hazards to flying, and for future development of new and existing main terminal airports including alternative facilities for relieving congestion thereat ..... \$4,000,000

Mr. CHEVRIER: This is the item which deals with the proposed zoning of airports.

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the point which was raised by Mr. Smith. What is the progress on this; how much zoning is being done at the main airports in Canada?

Mr. BALDWIN: We are well along in our zoning program.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Have you completed zoning for the Dorval and Malton airports?

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes; although it is possible that further adjustments in the existing regulations may have to take place as new runways are built as the zoning is related to the particular runway pattern.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is this applicable only to the main transcontinental airports?

Mr. BALDWIN: So far, I think, we have zoned six or seven major airports now, and have five or six zoning plans under way.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How much of this item did you spend last year.

Mr. BALDWIN: This particular vote is a dual vote. It is primarily in connection with the acquisition of land as distinct from zoning. At a number of airports we have primarily been carrying forward a program of long-term land acquisition to obtain enough land for future development of airports. Over and above that we superimpose the zoning which applies primarily to the land we may not own.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): This point came up as a result of a distressing problem which has occurred at many Canadian cities where airports are being moved to such an extent out of the centre of the city that it is difficult for air transport to become competitive with any other source of travel. The indication by one airline, T.C.A., for example, is that with the required new length of runway strips one has to wonder whether the present zoning regulations take into consideration the new lengths that are still going to be required within the next ten years and whether or not our present regulations are still sufficient to meet the demand and that in another five years they may have to move the airports a further distance out of the cities.

Mr. BALDWIN: This has been a continuing item in the estimates for roughly three years. We have been buying land very substantially to cover our future requirements so that if the time arrives when we have to put in a ten thousand foot runway then we will have the land at that time rather than be caught.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): Your engineers are not able to give you any indication as to whether or not the turbo-driven aircraft have pretty well reached the point when they can establish what is going to be a maximum length of runway required.

Mr. BALDWIN: This is one of the great problems of civil aviation which has bothered the International Civil Aviation Organization for many years.

The problem is really one which rests in the hands of the manufacturers; that is, how to persuade the manufacturers not to build aircraft which require more and more in the way of runways.

As far as we are able to determine, we are about at the end of a cycle in the present stage of the big power jets.

Mr. RYNARD: I am wondering, if considering this problem, that we are dealing with the municipality and it is up to them. Mr. Smith spoke of the distance from the centre of the city. I wonder if there should not be co-operation with the cities to give us a through runway to get downtown in a hurry. That would perhaps be in the interests of the city. I am wondering whether or not the Department of Transport is working in cooperation with the city where an airport is located? It would seem to be a matter of good common sense if you have a good straight throughway down to the centre of the city that you have overcome most of the problem.

Mr. HEES: We endeavour in every instance to point out this very real need to the municipality in order to try to persuade them to make such a throughway available, but very often we find that they turn around and ask us to build a road, which is not our responsibility. All that we can do is point out the need and hope that they are a far-seeing municipality.

Mr. RYNARD: Perhaps you could use the threat of not improving that airport if they did not build a road.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it possible to find out how much of that \$5 million was spent last year under this vote?

Mr. BALDWIN: We spent more than \$5 million last year. My recollection is that we spent between \$5 million and \$6 million, but I do not have the exact figure before me.

Mr. GARLAND: Are there any plans or negotiations going on to acquire land in the vicinity of the North Bay airport?

Mr. HEES: No. We have all the land we need.

Mr. McMILLAN: What action do you take to prevent the erection of houses such as high buildings? Do you have to pay so much for the land surrounding airports in order to prevent the erection of high buildings or towers or anything like that?

Mr. HEES: In some cases we buy the land and in others we rely on the zoning regulations which do not allow buildings of a certain height to be erected within a certain proximity of an airfield.

Mr. McMILLAN: Do you have to pay the owner of the land?

Mr. HEES: Yes; in some instances.

Item agreed to.

Item 515. Loan to the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation in accordance with section 14 of the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation Act for additions and betterments to facilities ..... \$2,400,000

Mr. CHEVRIER: This is a capital expenditure. What is it for?

Mr. BALDWIN: The largest single item is in connection with the proposed Canada-U.K. telephone cable.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Has item 512 been carried?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HEES: We do not mind reverting to it if you have some question which you would like to ask?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was not here at the time.

Mr. HEES: That is quite all right. This is an informative committee. As the deputy minister points out, we might not be able to answer all the questions on the seaway authority because the head of the seaway authority is not here, but we will do our best.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is that the final amount required for the construction of the facility.

Mr. HEES: As far as I know it is; yes. I would say there will probably be some cleaning up items as there always seem to be on any project, but we hope it will pretty well clean it up.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Will you seek legislation to increase the \$300 million because this takes you beyond the \$300 million authorized by parliament?

Mr. HEES: This may have to be done.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have a lot more, but—

Mr. McMILLAN: Including this \$128 million, what is the exact total advanced to the seaway authority?

Mr. HEES: It is estimated the expenditure will be \$321,862,800.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Was the Dominion Government compensated to any extent by the Ontario Hydro for the closing of the old Cornwall Canal because of the fact that there is no necessity of constructing an alternative fourteen-foot channel which had been envisaged in the original plans?

Mr. HEES: We have not completed our final settlement with Ontario Hydro, but the factor is being taken into consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): In the International Rapids Act there is a specific reference to compensation being required in lieu of construction of an alternative fourteen-foot channel.

Mr. HEES: That has been taken into account.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the status then, following that question of Mr. Campbell's, of the agreement between Ontario and the federal government? Is it being renegotiated at the present time?

Mr. HEES: I am advised that at the end of the construction period we expect to get our arrangements with the Ontario Hydro cleared up.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The act as it stands is no longer applicable?

Mr. HEES: That is right.

Item 467. Air Transport Board—Salaries and Other Expenses, including the Canadian Delegation to the International Civil Aviation Organization ..... \$337,179

Mr. WRATTEN: Mr. Chairman, what does that item cover?

Mr. HEES: This item covers the licencing and regulatory board that deals with aircraft and applications of aircraft companies.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How many applications are there before the board now for service in competition with T.C.A.?

Mr. HEES: There are four applications.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May we have the names?

Mr. G. MORISSET (*Member, Air Transport Board*): C.P.A.—transcontinental; P.W.A.—Pacific Western Airlines, transcontinental also. We have an application from Quebec Air for service between Montreal and Quebec city, and between Chicoutimi and Montreal. We also have a P.W.A. application for service between Regina and Saskatoon.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask the minister if in view of this answer the recommendations contained in the Wheatcroft report are going to become, as it were, instructions to the Air Transport Board on these lines?



Mr. HEES: No they are not. They have been referred to the Board as pertinent material and information which will be of assistance to them in considering the whole matter.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the status as to the two transcontinental applications? Are they being proceeded with?

Mr. HEES: Yes. All the hearings will be held as soon as it is possible to hold them. As you know the chairman of the Air Transport Board has had a heart attack. As soon as we can proceed with the hearings they will be proceeded with.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might be excused for a moment? I have a telephone call from the Prime Minister's secretary and it may be important.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we can carry on. If there are any questions you wish the minister to answer, he will answer them on his return.

Mr. PASCOE: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the witness to say something about a P.W.A. service between Regina and Saskatoon? Is that an application?

Mr. MORISSET: That is an application which is pending now before the board.

Mr. PASCOE: Are they not operating a service there now?

Mr. MORISSET: They are operating a prairie service between Edmonton, Lloydminster, North Battleford, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert and Regina.

Mr. PASCOE: That is the point I am trying to get at. This is a separate service which leaves Moose Jaw out?

Mr. MORISSET: On that service they have no local traffic flight between Regina and Saskatoon. They have asked to have that right. That application is pending before the Board.

Mr. PASCOE: When is that hearing coming up?

Mr. MORISSET: Some time in the fall.

Mr. PASCOE: Thank you.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Coming back to the two applications of C.P.A. and P.W.A., the minister said the applications were being processed. When were the applications made?

Mr. MORISSET: Of which one are you speaking?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am speaking of these two transcontinental applications which will be in competition to T.C.A. service. When were they made?

Mr. MORISSET: Some time in December.

Mr. CHEVRIER: When will they be heard? I realize the chairman is ill but does the board not proceed with cases in some instances when the chairman is not available?

Mr. MORISSET: We plan on holding these hearings as soon as possible in the fall.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): In respect of applications for local licences in small municipalities, would hearings in that regard be postponed or is there a preambulating agent of the board that normally hears these applications for local licences in respect of small airport business? Would they necessarily be postponed because of the incapacity of the chairman of the board?

Mr. MORISSET: No, those hearings will go on. The board can function with two members. We need a quorum of two. As long as we have that quorum the board can render decisions. These applications will be dealt with in due course even though the chairman might not be in attendance.

Item agreed to.

Item 468. Board of Transport Commissioners—Administration, Operation and maintenance.

Item 468 agreed to.

Supplementary item 649 agreed to.

Item 469. Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—Amount to be credited to the Railway Grade Crossing Fund, in addition to the amount, if any, to be credited to the Fund under the railway Act in the current fiscal year, for the purpose of contributing towards the cost of an exceptional number of railway grade separation projects on the Trans-Canada Highway in British Columbia.... \$10,000,000

Mr. McMILLAN: Is this amount to be spent in British Columbia.

Mr. BALDWIN: No, sir. This is a general allocation to the grade crossing fund in order to increase the amount which the board may authorize or allocate to grade separations anywhere in Canada.

Mr. McMILLAN: In other words that amount will be \$15 million this year?

Mr. BALDWIN: That is correct, sir.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): Mr. Chairman, could we have some information as to how this fund is administered? I would particularly like to know how a community goes about taking advantage of this particular fund.

Mr. BALDWIN: You make an application to the Board of Transport Commissioners. The Act sets up certain specified percentages that may be shared as between municipalities, the railways and moneys out of this fund. It is a formal application to the board. The board may or may not authorize the project. If it does, it says how the cost is to be shared between the parties.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): In other words the Board of Transport Commissioners decides whether or not there is justification in an individual request?

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes, if funds are to be voted out of this federal grant here. If there are no federal funds involved the board does not come into it.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): What is the usual contribution by a municipality involved?

Mr. BALDWIN: It varies quite a lot, sir. There was some slight error. We thought this item had been passed and the experts from the board are not here.

Mr. WRATTEN: Was this item not before the railway committee yesterday, or the day before?

The CHAIRMAN: That committee is the sessional Committee in respect of Government-owned Railways.

I see that Mr. Kerr and Mr. Dumontier of the Board of Transport Commissioners are here now and they will answer that question.

Mr. R. KERR (*General Counsel, Low Branch, Board of Transport Commissioners*): In the case of automatic protection at crossings there is a rule of division which provides for 60 per cent from the fund, 15 per cent from the railway and 25 per cent from the municipality, unless there are special conditions which, in the board's opinion, or by agreement by the parties, warrant some different allocation.

In the case of subways, overhead bridges and grade separations, each case is looked upon on its own merits. There is a special allocation of contribution ordered as the board sees fit.

Mr. BRASSARD (*Chicoutimi*): Does this fund apply only to C.N.R. and C.P.R., or to private railways? I have in mind, for example, the Roberval-Saguenay Railway.

Mr. KERR: It applies to all railways under the jurisdiction of parliament; not to privately controlled railways.

Mr. FISHER: There was some mention in the Sessional Committee on rails and shipping the other day that a private citizen could initiate some sort of a study or investigation, or some move in this regard, is that correct?

Mr. KERR: The board always gives consideration to any request from any member of the public affecting the safety of the public. In respect of highway crossings the municipality which has jurisdiction over the road is more concerned than one individual citizen because the municipality may have to bear some portion of the cost.

Any request from individual citizens are always passed on and considered with the municipality and the railway concerned.

Mr. FISHER: I was thinking of a specific case where last week three people were killed at Hornepayne at a crossing which is—I may be wrong—just outside the municipality.

Obviously as a result of an accident you have some reason for feeling that this may be a bad situation. Who can take the initiative in getting some sort of work done?

Mr. KERR: Every accident on a railroad crossing is investigated by the board's staff in the first instance, and the board itself may feel that some protection is necessary at the crossing. If so the board would order it. Otherwise the request comes from the municipality which has the crossing within its boundaries.

Mr. FISHER: The point I wanted to clear up is that in my constituency, and I am sure there is a great amount of unorganized territory in other members' constituencies—for instance, the C.P.R. runs through White River. That is a divisional point but White River is not a municipality.

Mr. KERR: That is not an unusual condition in Canada. There is a considerable amount of unorganized territory.

Mr. FISHER: In that particular case where can the initiative come from?

Mr. KERR: Any person can initiate the matter and direct it to the attention of the board. The board will then take it up with the appropriate authority; that may be the province or somebody else.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask a question or two on the broader aspect of railway grade crossings?

There is a large amount in the estimates, relatively speaking—\$15 million. Is it not a fact that there are many applications before the board for overpasses and underpasses?

Mr. KERR: Our director of engineering is here. He is more familiar with the applications than I am and perhaps he can give you that information.

Mr. J. E. DUMONTIER (*Director, Engineering Branch, Board of Transport Commissioners*): We have quite a number of applications. I have them all listed here under various provinces and estimated costs, and the amount which would be needed from the railway grade crossing fund if the board applied the full contribution of 60 per cent.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How many applications have you before the board now I suppose it is a matter of hundreds, is it?

Mr. DUMONTIER: I beg your pardon?

Mr. CHEVRIER: How many applications are there before the board now? I take it there are hundreds?

Mr. DUMONTIER: No, I do not think there are hundreds at the present time. I would say there are around 65.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How many are outstanding?

Mr. DUMONTIER: These applications are outstanding that are before the board now.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it a fact that some of the difficulty is that there are so many of these applications it is not possible to deal with a large number like that over a period of a year or so, in order to use up the amount in the grade crossing fund?



Mr. DUMONTIER: We have been using the full amount of the grade crossing fund since the amendments were made in 1955. We have had enough applications to use the full amount.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you speak louder? They cannot hear on the other side of the room.

Mr. DUMONTIER: We have been able to use the full allotment.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Does that mean that all the applications which are made for overpasses and underpasses are dealt with immediately?

Mr. DUMONTIER: That is right, sir.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Does the board set up any sort of a priority system having regard to vehicular traffic going over crossings in respect of applications for grade separations?

Mr. DUMONTIER: This priority is considered in the case of protection at highway crossings, but in respect of grade separations, the reason for them is not always a question of safety, but a question of convenience also. We may have a crossing that is well protected where there has been no accident for years and yet we have an application for a grade separation. This is considered justifiable from the point of view of convenience.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Yet in spite of light signals, a heavily travelled highway may still have a fairly high percentage of accidents after the light system is installed?

Mr. DUMONTIER: Yes. I think about one-third of highway crossing accidents happen on protected crossings. We consider that in respect of those crossings which are protected there is more traffic going over them.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): A grade separation is really the best protection for a heavily travelled highway?

Mr. DUMONTIER: I would say that most of the applications that we have in regard to grade separation are mainly for convenience rather than protection.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): How long would it normally take from the time you receive an application until the time construction began? I know this varies in respect of each individual case.

Mr. DUMONTIER: It varies very much. In the case of a subway the detail plans are prepared by the railway. This may take eight months before we can get the detailed plan ready.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It may take two years?

Mr. DUMONTIER: It sometimes takes two years.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): It sometimes takes five years.

That answer was in respect of the preparation of the plans. From the time you get an application until it is finally approved, how long does that take?

Mr. DUMONTIER: There has to be negotiation between the railway company and the municipality involved. This depends on who sends the application in.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): A subsidiary question; why does the railway pay only a comparatively small portion of the cost?

Mr. DUMONTIER: The cost varies quite a bit. The apportioning is generally made by agreement between the railway and the highway authorities. If they do not agree then the board has to rule on it.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): I was speaking of these figures—60 per cent; 15 per cent and 25 per cent.

Mr. DUMONTIER: That is in respect of automatic protection?

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Yes.

Mr. DUMONTIER: I think that has been accepted throughout Canada pretty well since it was started.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): It seems very lenient in regard to the railway companies.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is that percentage not provided by statute?

Mr. DUMONTIER: No.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The 60 per cent share taken out of the grade crossing fund was much less than that at one time?

Mr. DUMONTIER: The share was 40 per cent out of the grade crossing fund until 1955.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That proportion was increased but the railway companies' proportion was not?

Mr. DUMONTIER: I think the railways' proportion was 30 per cent.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That percentage has now been decreased to 15 per cent.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): I am particularly interested in this matter because there is a mainline of the C.N.R. and also a main highway to Jasper running across my constituency. There are no big cities along that road but there are a number of small sized towns. These crossings are all within the boundaries of these small towns.

It seems to me it is going to be quite a burden on those towns. There is a definite need for crossing protection in two or three of those towns at this time because of the number of accidents that have been occurring. One accident occurred recently at Stony Plain.

If these towns are going to be required to pay that share—I understand from talking to my colleague here that these signals cost in the neighbourhood of \$12,000 for installation—it will involve \$4,000 each. Is there any other way of doing this other than asking these small towns to pay \$4,000 in order to protect people from outside of the towns who are coming to the towns?

Mr. KERR: I am advised that the simple automatic protection consisting of flashing lights and bells, without gates, costs around \$6,000 or \$7,000. The \$12,000 you mentioned may relate to more elaborate installations perhaps where there are automatic gates which come down.

This whole problem of contribution by municipalities and by railways was the subject of public hearings across Canada in 1953 and 1954, I believe. As a result of that inquiry into grade crossings conducted by the board the board issued a report to the governor in council. That inquiry had many representations from many municipalities and railway companies as to the proportion that the municipality and the railway respectively should bear in respect of the cost of protection at crossings.

I think it is not unusual for the municipality to complain that the amount which they have to bear is too high, but that percentage, in the board's judgment in respect of the ordinary case where there are no unusual circumstances, is the amount which they should bear.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): I disagree with that judgment because these towns are situated as a result of the railway being there, and it seems to me that it is very unfair that these towns should be asked to pay more than the railways. I feel that is not fair.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it not a fact, sir, that there are so many of these crossings from one end of the country to the other that the amount in the grade crossing fund is infinitesimal in regard to dealing with all these dangerous crossings from one end of the country to the other?

Mr. KERR: Mr. Chevrier, there are approximately 33,000 crossings in Canada.

Mr. PASCOE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an answer in regard to a local problem in Saskatchewan.

A farmer lived in a municipality right at a railway crossing. The town has now closed that crossing and constructed a new crossing which is closer to the town. Has he any redress at all to the board, or is that a municipal matter completely? The road was there and the crossing was there but the town has now moved the crossing closer to town and closed the other one off. Could this farmer apply for a private crossing?

Mr. KERR: He has no redress as far as the Railway Act is concerned. I do not know whether he would have a redress under provincial law.

Mr. RYNARD: Mr. Chairman, is there any specific regulation that grade crossings should be installed when a province or municipality is building a new road or repairing a road?

Mr. KERR: There is no statutory requirement.

Mr. RYNARD: I wonder why that is not done when new roads are being constructed? I know of a new highway which has been constructed that still has level crossings.

I am wondering whether this is not the whole crux of the problem. There should be some correlation between the Department of Transport and the provincial department of highways to the end that level crossings would be eliminated on new roads, or on roads which are being rebuilt.

Mr. KERR: As I said, there is no statutory requirement.

Mr. RYNARD: I wonder if this committee could make a recommendation in that regard? It would seem to me that this would be common sense. You are going to be dealing with this problem over and over again.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rynard, would it be wise if instead of making a recommendation here, we asked the Board of Transport Commissioners to look into the matter with a view of seeing if there is something that could be done to help along this line that you have suggested?

Mr. RYNARD: Mr. Chairman, could I leave that request to you?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should ask the Board of Transport Commissioners now to take that under consideration.

Mr. KERR: I would be glad to bring it to the attention of the board. I am sure they would consider it.

Perhaps I should say that where a highway is about to be constructed across a railway the party which is constructing the highway, be it the department of highways, a city or a municipality—must apply to the Board of Transport Commissioners for leave to construct that highway.

Sometimes the party wishes a level crossing and the railway company, for instance, might think it should be a grade separation.

Mr. RYNARD: I am thinking of the road that goes between Toronto and points north—the 400 highway going north has level crossings and that is a very heavily travelled highway.

Mr. BALDWIN (*Peace River*): Mr. Chairman, I know of a case which involves a major bridge which carries both vehicular and rail traffic. There is a system of controls consisting of gates and flashing lights which are manually controlled. The people in charge of these controls are railway men. These controls are operated so that when rail traffic is on the bridge vehicular traffic is stopped, and vice versa.

It seems that the railroad people in the operation of these manual controls discriminate against vehicular traffic.



Are there regulations within the scope of which the attention of the railway company can be called to the fact that there is this discrimination? Are there regulations covering this form of control, or has the railroad company *carte blanche* control?

Mr. KERR: I am advised by the director of engineering that our board has received no complaints of that nature.

Mr. BALDWIN (*Peace River*): You can consider my statement here as a complaint.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Further to Dr. Rynard's statement in regard to the 400 highway, it is now possibly the most heavily travelled highway in Canada. The Board of Transport Commissioners considered that since it was a completely new road that a level crossing on this 400 highway at Thornton where the northwestern line of the C.N.R. crosses was sufficient, it being a controlled access highway designed for the purpose of express traffic. There was a completely new highway cut across the fields.

Mr. RYNARD: Just to finish Mr. Smith's comment, I would like to draw the attention of the commissioners here to the fact that there have been at least two or three people killed on that particular road.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): That was their own fault.

Mr. RYNARD: Perhaps it is always the fault of the people killed but nevertheless they are killed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Let us have some agreement on this thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if they were alive today they might not think they were to blame.

Mr. BALDWIN (*Peace River*): Going back to my original question; it was suggested there were no complaints. I think that situation might be rectified. However, if there were complaints, are there regulations which would control the way in which the traffic is controlled? That is the point I wanted to get clear.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Perhaps I could help, if I might.

Is it not a fact that it depends a great deal on whether the bridge is owned by the railway? If this bridge is owned by the railway I suppose the railway has certain priority over vehicular traffic.

Mr. BALDWIN: The situation here is that the bridge was built by the province of Alberta for the purpose of carrying both rail and vehicular traffic at a time when the province of Alberta operated the Northern Alberta railway. The Northern Alberta Railway was, of course, acquired by the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a very mixed up problem, Mr. Chevrier.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Are there not then regulations of the board that apply to the highway and railway priority?

Mr. KERR: There are no general regulations but the board in individual cases has made regulations, where the safety of the public is concerned.

Mr. BALDWIN: And in respect of convenience, I suppose?

Mr. KERR: Where a railway operation is involved the board would have the power to make an appropriate arrangement.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): In the case of these crossings do any of the provinces contribute?

Mr. KERR: Yes, they contribute in each individual case by agreement. Our board does not impose a portion of the cost to the province because it has no power to do so.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have now concluded our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Transport. We will prepare a report in this regard and meet on next Tuesday morning. That meeting will be held *in Camera*.

The CHAIRMAN: We now have Bill No. C-26, an Act to incorporate the Lakehead Harbour Commissioners.

Clause 1 of this Bill reads:

"This Act may be cited as the Lakehead Harbour Commissioners Act."

Perhaps before we proceed I had better introduce the gentlemen who are here to answer questions in that regard.

Mr. CHEVRIER: In regard to clause 1, Mr. Chairman, I suppose there will be a general discussion entertained?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask the minister if there are applications from any other communities along the seaway for harbour commissions such as this?

Mr. HEES: Cornwall has asked for a harbour commission. That request is under consideration at the present time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is an application made by the city of Cornwall?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. FISHER: How is the Windsor harbour board working, to your knowledge?

Mr. HEES: This board is just getting organized at the present time.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): What is the position of the application by the Cornwall municipality in respect of a harbour commission?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Norman Wilson of the Department of Transport will answer that question.

Mr. NORMAN WILSON: This application has recently been received and is under consideration by the board.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Has there been any previous application from Cornwall for a harbour commission?

Mr. WILSON: Not prior to the development of the seaway. This is a current application.

Mr. FISHER: Was there any discussion in respect of the selection of the name "Lakehead Harbour Commissioners"? Was there any discussion in that regard? Who put forward the name, Lakehead Harbour Commissioners?

Mr. HEES: I do not think I can answer that. I think it was a local decision as far as I know. The locality has always been known as the "Lakehead".

Mr. BADANAI: I think I can answer that question.

Both the cities are interested in this commission. We could not call it the Fort William harbour commission or the Port Arthur harbour commission so we called it the Lakehead Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. FISHER: As long as the name just grew I think it is all right.

Mr. HEES: Nobody imposed the name or objected to it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is the application in regard to Cornwall the only application apart from this which has come up for consideration by the Department of Transport?

Mr. HEES: They are the only applications of which I am aware at the present time.

Mr. FISHER: I have two questions to ask. Could you give us a little more information with regard to how the money which is coming out of government finances is going to be spent on terminals and wharfs.

Mr. HEES: There will be an appropriation by the Department of Public Works for the construction of facilities.

Mr. FISHER: That will become part of the responsibilities of this Lakehead Harbour Commission?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. FISHER: There is no question at the present time of even talking about giving them the long-term capital project?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How much is it again; how much is the expenditure for the wharf?

Mr. HEES: The best information we have is that it is estimated it will cost somewhere between \$3 and \$4 million.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Is the incorporation of a harbour commission an essential prerequisite to the construction by the department of harbour facilities? In other words, does the department ever construct harbour facilities without the incorporation of a harbour commission prior thereto?

Mr. HEES: We have many public harbours in which the government constructs facilities.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): And it subsequently, after it has been in operation for some time, possibly appoints a harbour commission?

Mr. HEES: Yes. There are three types of harbours. There are harbours owned and operated by the National Harbours Board, then there are harbours under municipal control like this one, and harbours like the Hamilton and Toronto harbours, and there are also public harbours.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): The department could conceivably construct harbour facilities of some sort at Cornwall without incorporating a harbour commission?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That would be the Department of Public Works, not the Department of Transport?

Mr. HEES: The facilities would be constructed by the government but it would be done under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Is it envisioned that this project will be self-liquidating?

Mr. HEES: No; not in the foreseeable future.

Mr. FISHER: This bill does not deal with the project at all. Perhaps I should not have introduced that.

The CHAIRMAN: At this point I will properly introduce Mr. Norman Wilson. Earlier I gave his title incorrectly; he is Director of Marine Services. He will be able to answer some of the questions.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 5—Members of Corporation.

Mr. FISHER: I would like to ask a question relating to clause 5 in respect of the commissioners appointed by the crown at Windsor. Could you tell me what backgrounds they have?

Mr. WILSON: Two of them are substantial businessmen who have retired.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Why do you require five commissioners instead of, for example, three?

Mr. HEES: This is a dual community.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I know it is two cities. I have a somewhat similar problem. I wonder what the reason is?



Mr. HEES: We consider that this is the number which will function best in this particular instance. One is appointed by each of the municipalities and three are appointed by the governor in council.

Mr. DRYSDALE: To give the government more or less control?

Mr. HEES: Well, I suppose so; yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You could have had seven.

Mr. HEES: We are investing a lot of money in this.

Clause 5 agreed to.

On Clause 6 (1)—Tenure of office

Mr. BADANAI: There is no provision for the appointment of a commissioner in the event of the death or resignation of any of the commissioners. I am sure that the city concerned should be appraised of and should approve, the appointment of a commissioner in the event of someone resigning.

Mr. HEES: What would take place is that if one of the three commissioners appointed by the governor in council were to die or resign, his successor would be appointed by the governor in council. If a commissioner appointed by Port Arthur or Fort William resigns or dies there will be an appointment by the respective city.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Why would a member of the council be considered ineligible? Is that a normal situation?

Mr. HEES: Because he has a direct interest too closely associated with the municipality.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Is that not desirable?

Mr. HEES: It is considered desirable he should be neutral.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): I see.

Clauses 6 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 9—Officers and employees and their compensation.

Mr. FISHER: At the present time we have a harbour master and some other people up there. Is it the intention, if possible, to use those people under the new set-up?

Mr. WILSON: The harbour master at Port Arthur and Fort William is a sub-agent of the Department of Transport, and he will continue in that capacity. He will relinquish his duties as harbour master. Such duties will then be discharged by an appointee of the commission.

Clause 9 agreed to.

On Clause 10—Jurisdiction within harbour.

Mr. BADANAI: This defines the powers of the corporation in respect of entry on to property owned by the crown, but it does not define the powers in respect of any property owned by the cities of Fort William or Port Arthur.

Mr. WILSON: The commission will only have jurisdiction over the municipality owned property that is assigned to them for administration and control. The situation will be the same in respect of federal property passed to them for administration.

Clause 10 agreed to.

On Clause 11 (1)—Property.

Mr. FISHER: I would like a bit more information with reference to sub-clause (2) of clause 11; "...subject to such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon at the time control thereof is transferred to it...".

Does that mean terms and conditions with the municipalities as far as property is concerned?

Mr. WILSON: Yes. That would be a matter for adjustment between the commission and the municipality.

Mr. FISHER: And also: "... and any property owned by Her Majesty ...". Is the C.N.R.'s property considered as being Her Majesty's property?

Mr. WILSON: No; that is private property.

Mr. BADANAI: The corporation would have power to expropriate property required for the purpose?

Mr. WILSON: Yes.

Mr. BADANAI: They would have the power to expropriate property from the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian National Railway?

Mr. WILSON: Only with the approval of the governor in council.

Clause 11 agreed to.

On Clause 12—Regulation and control of water-front property.

Mr. BADANAI: In respect of subclause (2) it would appear that the harbour commission should be subject to taxes on a full basis as is any other property owned by the federal government. What is the provision in respect of taxation on the installations?

Mr. WILSON: I know of no case where a municipality has taxed a harbour commission for its property. It is considered, I think, as a contribution.

Mr. BADANAI: There is no provision for assessment of taxes?

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Does this matter come within the terms of the Municipal Grants Act whereby the federal government makes a grant each year in lieu of municipal taxes?

Mr. BADANAI: That is precisely the question I asked.

Mr. HEES: I do not think so. Mr. Chevrier you may be able to answer that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I would question why it would not.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): The act just applies to federal property and this is property owned by the commission. Legally, there is a valid distinction there.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it not a fact, in situations where property is owned by the Canadian National Railways, the National Harbours Board, or other crown agencies, that for the purposes of the Municipal Grants Act they are considered crown property.

Mr. SMITH (*Simcoe North*): Not the C.N.R.

The CHAIRMAN: This is something which will have to be brought before the Department of Finance, I imagine.

Mr. HEES: Suppose we obtain an answer on this from the Department of Finance and have it ready when the bill comes up before the house.

Mr. FISHER: It has been the practice of the Department of Public Works, in respect of the channels, to do maintenance dredging. There will be a certain amount of maintenance dredging necessary over the years to come. Does this mean that the commission will be in charge of that dredging, or will the Department of Public Works still carry it on?

Mr. WILSON: The Department of Public Works in all probability will carry out the dredging as in the past, at least until such time as the corporation becomes self-supporting. They may, at some stage of the development, assess a certain proportion of the dredging cost against the commission, but that will not be the case at the beginning.

Mr. FISHER: The base of the Kam River every so often has to be cleaned out. The bill for that work will not fall on the Commission.

Mr. WILSON: That will be a question for the Department of Public Works to answer, but I know of no other case where it has.

Clause 12 agreed to.

On Clause 13—By-Laws.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I have a question in respect of subclause (1) (f) of Clause 13 with reference to the appointment of constables. What is the practice? We have a somewhat similar problem. I wonder how the constables appointed by the harbour commission could enforce the by-laws because there is no provision for power to arrest.

Mr. BADANAI: Would that not come under the municipal Police Force Act?

Mr. WILSON: It depends on the manner in which the constables are appointed? I submit it is largely a matter for municipal arrangement or arrangement between the commissioners and the municipality.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Would the constable have to be a constable for the commission and also, in effect, a special constable for the municipality or the R.C.M.P.? The reason I am interested is that we have a similar problem with the North Fraser Harbour Commission. When I looked into it I did not think that they actually had any power to make an arrest to enforce the by-law.

Mr. HEES: I would say that this is something to be worked out between the Harbour Commissioners and the municipality.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): These constables would be analogous to the security staff of a private corporation and in many instances might even be members of the Corps of Commissionaires. It would be more in the nature of a security staff than an actual police staff?

Mr. HEES: Yes.

Mr. DRYSDALE: What good are they if they cannot make an arrest.

Mr. HEES: If the harbour commissioners do not want to appoint them it is up to them.

Clauses 13 and 14 agreed to.

On Clause 15—Charges against revenues.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper Edson*): I have a general question in respect of the whole financing of the harbour commission. What effect is the setting up of this harbour commission going to have on the movement of material through the harbours I am thinking particularly of western grain. Will it increase the cost of the movement?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It has nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper Edson*): In other words, will there be a charge against traffic for the use of the harbour?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The same charges as exist now.

Clauses 15 and 16 agreed to.

On Clause 17—Expropriation proceedings under Railway Act.

Mr. BADANAI: According to Clause 17, provision is made for the commission to purchase lands. Both the cities of Port Arthur and Fort William have offered lands to the commission for the purpose of establishing these facilities. There was no mention of selling the property. Does the government intend to purchase the property from the municipalities or is this a donation by the municipalities of the land upon which the facilities are being constructed?



Mr. WILSON: One of the purposes of the creation of a harbour commission is the development of a joint interest in the whole enterprise. It has always been a practice by the municipalities interested in harbour development to make a donation to the commission of property suitable for harbour development. This has been a prerequisite in the creation of a commission. So far as the acquisition of additional land is concerned after a commission has been created, that is a separate case and a different matter.

Clause 17 agreed to.

On Clause 18—Valuation of goods under Customs Act.

Mr. FISHER: I would like some idea of the revenue which came in from ship rates in the past in that harbour?

The CHAIRMAN: The minister gave that information in a speech he made the other day in the house.

Mr. HEES: I said: "The logical site for the terminus, if thorough investigation proves its suitability, is astride the boundary between the two cities. The commissioners would also have harbour dues and water-lot lease revenues, which last year amounted to \$12,000 and \$1,800 respectively."

Clauses 18 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. BADANAI: May I ask one question before you leave the subject? It has to do with the appointment of these commissioners by the government. We are now, in the city of Fort William advertising for applications from suitable persons who wish to apply to act as commissioners. Are you going to advertise the positions in respect of appointment of the commissioners appointed by Order in Council, or are you going to accept the recommendations of the municipalities in respect of the appointment of the commissioners who are to be appointed by the governor in council.

Mr. HEES: The city of Fort William will have the right to appoint one commissioner and the city of Port Arthur the other, and three will be appointed by the governor in council. We will take advice of people whom we think are in a position to advise us as to who the three commissioners whom we will appoint ought to be.

Mr. FISHER: I hope the minister will not let political considerations enter into it.

Mr. HEES: I am sure the hon. member knows that the minister would never do that.

Mr. CAMPBELL (*Stormont*): Is there any provision as to salary for a commissioner, and what would be a normal stipend?

Mr. HEES: Salaries have not been fixed. I am told it is customary that the salaries are either non-existent or are nominal at the beginning.

Mr. FISHER: I think there is a gentleman in Fort William whom you might consider by the name of Charnock. I do not know his political affiliation.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the enacting clause, title and Bill carry? Shall I report the bill to the House?

Agreed.

Mr. HEES: I will have the answer, I trust, to the question which arose with reference to clause 13, when the bill comes up in the house.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister, Mr. Wilson, and gentlemen.





## Index

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT ESTIMATES

PROCEEDINGS Nos. 1-5 inclusive.

PAGES NUMBERED 9-171 inclusive.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
414 Departmental Administration.....	9-47
415 St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers—Canadian Section.....	50
416 Canal Services—Administration.....	52-65
417 Canal Services—Operation and Maintenance.....	65
418 Canal Services—Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	65
419 Marine Services—Administration.....	65-70, 89-90
420 Marine Service Steamers—Administration, Operation and Maintenance	74
421 Marine Services—Construction or Acquisition of Vessels and Equip- ment.....	70-71
422 Aids to Navigation—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	71-74
423 Aids to Navigation—Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	74
424 Nautical Services—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	77
425 Pilotage Service—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	77-83
426 Steamship Inspection Service.....	84-88
427 Marine Reporting Service.....	88
428 Ship Channel Service—Administration, Operation and Maintenance...	88
429 Contract Dredging.....	88
430 Railways and Steamship Services—Repairs and Expenses—Official Railway Cars.....	107
433 Strait of Canso—Transportation Improvements and Facilities.....	107
434 Strait of Canso—Causeway Maintenance.....	107
435 Enlargement of Dock and Terminal Facilities at North Sydney, N.S....	107
436 Construction—Dock and Terminal Facilities at Port aux Basques, Nfld.	108
437 Construction or Acquisition of Auto Ferry Vessels and Equipment....	108-109
438 Newfoundland Coastal Services—Construction or Acquisition of Passenger-Cargo Vessels and Equipment.....	109
439 Yarmouth, N.S.—Bar Harbour, Maine—Ferry Service.....	109-110
440 Surveys of Newfoundland Railway Properties.....	110
441 Degaussing Canadian-owned ships.....	110-111
444 Subsidy of \$25,000 per mile rail construction.....	111
445 Pension to former pilots.....	111
446 Railway Employees—Provident Fund.....	111-112
447 Supplemental Pension Allowances to former employees of Newfoundland Railways, Steamships and Telecommunication Services.....	112
448 Payment to the widow of the late John H. Tudhope.....	112
449 Air Services—Administration.....	115-117
450 Air Services—Construction Services Administration.....	117-118
451 Radio Aids to Air and Marine Navigation—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	118-121
452 Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equip- ment.....	121-126, 144-145
453 Radio Act and Regulations—Administration, Operation and Main- tenance.....	126-128
454 Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equip- ment.....	129
455 Telegraph and Telephone Service—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	129
456 Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equip- ment.....	129
457 Meteorological Division—Administration, Operation and Main- tenance.....	129-132



<i>Item No.</i>		<i>Pages</i>
458	Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	132-133
459	Control of Civil Aviation.....	133
460	Airways and Airports—Operation and Maintenance.....	133-138
461	Airway and Airport Traffic Control.....	138-140
462	Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	140-143
463	Air Services—Grants for the development of Civil Aviation.....	157
464	Contributions to Municipalities or Public Bodies for Construction and improvements of Airports on Land acquired by such organizations.....	157-160
465	Contributions toward Airport Development and Other Airport Projects.....	160
466	Contributions to Other Governments or International Agencies.....	161
467	Air Transport Board—Salaries and Other Expenses.....	164-166
468	Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	166
469	Amount to be credited to the Railway Grade Crossing Fund.....	166-171
470	Canadian Maritime Commission—Administration.....	90-93
471	Canadian Maritime Commission—Steamship Subventions for Coastal Services.....	93-102
472	National Harbours Board—Advances.....	102-106
512	Loans to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.....	50-52
513	Canal Services—Acquisition of Land—Cornwall Navigation System...	65
514	For the acquisition of land for control of properties in the vicinity of main terminal airports.....	162-163
515	Loan to the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation.....	163-164
516	Advances to the National Harbours Board.....	106
628	Departmental Administration.....	47-50
629	Canal Services—Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	65
630	Aids to Navigation—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	74
631	Aids to Navigation—Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	74
632	Nautical Services—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	77
633	Pilotage Service—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	83
634	Construction or Acquisition of Auto-Ferry Vessels and Equipment...	71
636	Inquiry into the coasting trade of Canada.....	88-89
637	Air Services—Administration.....	117
638	Air Services—Construction Services Administration.....	118
639	Radio Aids to Air and Marine Navigation—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	121
640	Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	129
641	Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, and Land Equipment.....	129
642	Meteorological Division—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	132
643	Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	133
644	Control of Civil Aviation.....	133
645	Airways and Airports—Operation and Maintenance.....	138
646	Airway and Airport Traffic Control.....	140
647	Construction or Acquisition of Buildings, Works, Land and Equipment.....	143
648	Contributions toward Airport Developments and Other Airport Projects.....	160-161
649	Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada—Administration, Operation and Maintenance.....	166
650	Canadian Maritime Commission—Administration.....	93
651	Canadian Maritime Commission—Steamship Subventions.....	102
661	Canal Services—Acquisition of Land—Cornwall Navigation System..	65
662	Increase to \$6,000,000—revolving fund.....	106-107